

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TONY CHENG,

Plaintiff,

v.

SCHLUMBERGER,

Defendant.

No. C 13-02641 JSW

**ORDER REGARDING REQUEST  
FOR INTERPRETATION  
REGARDING MEET AND  
CONFER IN PERSON AND  
INSTRUCTION REGARDING  
SECURITY**

On September 30, 2013, Plaintiff filed a request for interpretation regarding meet and confer in person and instruction regarding security. (Docket No. 85.) With respect to the first portion, the Court clarifies that it has stated that the parties may meet and confer by telephone and it has not required in person meetings. The Court also shall not issue an advisory opinion on what circumstances might arise that would lead the Court to reconsider that ruling.

Plaintiff also asks that the Court require the Defendant to post security under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65. That request is DENIED, because the Court has not issued an injunction. To the extent Plaintiff is asking when it might be appropriate to issue security or an undertaking or when the Defendants might be required to reimburse costs, the Court construes that as a request for legal advice. As the Court advised Plaintiff at the status conference held on August 30, 2013, the Court cannot provide Plaintiff with legal advice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 1, 2013

  
JEFFREY S. WHITE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE